

businessmen, should support this program. He did not know why, as good businessmen, they were reluctant to do so.

What the Senator from Missouri has just said is to the point. Many of the practices normally used in business, are called socialism when applied to government.

I thank the Senator from Missouri for his close attention to the bill. He studied the bill closely and attended the hearings as faithfully as did any other member of the committee, if not more so. He has been of great assistance to me and to the committee in the hearings and in marking up the bill.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the distinguished chairman. I am confident he would agree with me that the bill before the Senate today is another weapon for the defense of the United States. As we defend this country and the rest of the free world under the leadership of the President against the advance of communism, we have here an economic weapon, a psychological weapon, a political weapon to assist us. For those good people who yearn for a better life in the underdeveloped countries we will have a spiritual weapon, as well.

I hope that the wishes of the chairman of the committee will be fulfilled in a practical and positive fashion when the Senate votes on the bill.

I thank the distinguished and able Senator from Wisconsin for his courtesy in yielding to me.

Mr. PROXMIER. I thank the distinguished Senator from Missouri.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that, without losing my right to the floor, I may yield to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut.

AMERICA ON DISPLAY

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, the Washington Star of Sunday, August 6, 1961, published an article entitled "Who Sends the Worst?" written by Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, the distinguished Chaplain of the Senate. I hope every Senator will read the article; indeed, I hope every Member of Congress will read it. The article is written with the clarity which is characteristic of Dr. Harris. It is a forceful article about a most important question. The question is, What kind of material are we exporting abroad? What kind of production are we exporting for our friends and neighbors across the seas for them to judge us by? Dr. Harris raises some serious questions.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

WHO SENDS THE WORST?

(By Dr. Frederick Brown Harris)

Somebody is selling America down the river. Somebody is exporting America's worst. In pictures and plays sent abroad the image of this sweet land of liberty, displayed before the eyes of multitudes, is not only that of the "Ugly American," but also of a depraved America.

A cultured, highly intelligent American woman, who has recently returned from a 6-month world tour, sadly made this comment: "Again and again, in city after city, my husband and I saw American films depicting the seamy and degrading aspects of life in our Nation. The impressions made upon foreigners caused us as Americans to hang our heads in shame. The crowds who gaze upon such stuff have every reason to think of us as barbarians devoid of decent moral standards."

Who is responsible for this base betrayal of our democracy at the very time we are waging a global war of ideas for the minds of men? Who is back of showing the peoples of Europe, Asia, Africa, and South America, as they stand in the valley of desolation, our moral slums, rather than our spiritual splendor?

Some depictions on stage and screen could not better fit into the total disparaging picture the Soviets are always painting of America if they had been selected by a "board of Communists" whose goal is the destruction of our free land.

When Khrushchev was peddling his wares on our shores he was rightly disgusted when coarse and vulgar estimates of stage values were evidenced in the entertainment menu set before him. It must be said that so far as its stage art is concerned Russia sends to other lands its best—and its best is very high. They proudly exhibit the superior side of their cultural life which, by the way, is not the product of the Soviets but is as old as the stars.

It is an infamous thing to hide our best and export our worst which, for some strange reason, the best allows to go on without adequate rebuke or refutation. What is going on is a potent factor in disfiguring the real image of America in the eyes of the rest of the world.

No wonder a distinguished U.S. Senator of the stature of Prescott Bush, of Connecticut, recently arose in the Senate to lift his voice against this abominable misrepresentation. In an impassioned address worthy of the Senate at its best, he declared: "It is high time that some board or commission should be given responsibility to recommend legislation to stop exporting the very worst depiction of American life, which presents our people as being morally depraved. Because of plays such as we have discussed, and some of the salacious and immoral movies that we export to distant countries, the time has arrived for us to take cognizance of the problem. Such exhibitions serve only to liquidate the good work that is being done all over the world at the taxpayer's expense. The export of filthy and immoral performances as being representative of U.S. life is shameful."

The Senator mentioned two plays now being performed in his State and scheduled to be shown this summer in several countries of South America. He read to the Senate a letter from a woman constituent, saying: "I went to see these plays but they were so terrible that I got up and walked out. One woman said that, after it was over, she felt as if she had fallen into a pile of garbage. Now, Senator, these plays are going to be sent to South America as an example of American life. Whoever is in charge of this department must be an enemy of the United States."

From the other side of the Senate aisle came the voice of Senator FRANK J. LAUSCH, of Ohio, who heartily joined in the conviction that through some legislation "we might be able to reach the pandemonium who are distributing licentious pictures throughout the world, and plays that bring upon us the hatred and shame of the people who see them. A film official from our South American state appeared before our subcom-

mission on Latin American Affairs and said—"all the good that you do with your foreign aid program is more than destroyed by the type of pictures you are sending to our country."

Senator FRANCIS CASE, of South Dakota, honored the memory of the parsonage home in which he was reared as he added his voice to those of the Senators from Connecticut and Ohio to say that by his personal observation he had been "ashamed and discouraged at the filthy films that are being sent and shown in various foreign cities, carrying a message that is untrue so far as America is concerned. They do far more harm than we can counter by expenditures of many millions of dollars through the U.S.A."

All this makes the query lifted above this spire a burning question. Who among us, for personal gain, is engaging in such fratricidal practices as they interpret liberty as license to betray? Whoever they are, these spiritual descendants of Judas, who for the lure of 80 pieces of silver multiplied by millions, are dealing in lewd pictures of America at its worst, must have the searchlight of an aroused Nation turned full upon them. They deserve to be publicly pilloried for an unpardonable sin.

When the world depends for its future so largely upon America's best, it is being maliciously shown America's worst. God forgive them for they know not what they do.

STAFF STUDY OF PUGWASH CONFERENCES

Mr. DODD. Madam President, in June of this year the Senate subcommittee issued a staff study of the Pugwash Conferences. It was a carefully researched, heavily documented report. To this I can testify personally, because I spent a good deal of time checking and editing it.

The primary purpose of this publication was to make certain essential information available to Western scientists and intellectuals who may participate in future East-West conferences.

It is important that Western representatives to such conferences be armed with the basic facts about the Soviet Academy of Sciences, about the discipline that governs Soviet intellectuals, about the manner in which the Communists have tried to shape such conferences for their own purposes. It is important, too, that they examine carefully the credentials of the chief sponsors of such conferences, because not all conferences are alike.

Whenever any such report is published, it can be anticipated that there will be attacks. The reaction to the Pugwash report was neither more nor less than par. There was the customary number of editorials assailing the subcommittee for witchhunting and for damaging the cause of international amity. The report was also assailed for making the point that Soviet intellectuals who attend such conferences do not come to them as humanistic scholars and free agents, but as intellectually disciplined agents of the Communist conspiracy.

It is noteworthy, however, that none of these criticisms, as far as I can tell, challenge the facts and the documentation contained in the report, because the facts and the documentation are incontrovertible.